Newcastle-Ottawa (NOS) RoB									
Study	**Selection**				**Comparability**	**Outcome**			**Overall quality**
	Representativeness of exposed cohort	**Selection of non-exposed cohort**	**Ascertaion of exposure**	**Outcome not present start study**	**Comparability of cohorts**	**Ascertain of outcome**	**Follow-up time enough**	**Adequacy of follow-up of cohorts**	
Moore et al. 2004 United Kingdom	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Good
Offenbacher et al. 2006 USA	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Good
Saddki et al. 2008 Malaysia	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Good
Agueda et al. 2008 Spain	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Good
Santacruz et al. 2010 Spain	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Good
Wolff et al. 2010 Argentina	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Good
Ali et al. 2012 Malaysia	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Good
Gallagher-Cobos et al. 2022 Spain	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Good
Good quality: 3 or 4 stars in Selection domain AND 1 or 2 stars in Comparability domain AND 2 or 3 stars in outcome/exposure domain									
Fair quality: 2 stars in Selection domain AND 1 or 2 stars in Comparability domain AND 2 or 3 stars in outcome/exposure domain									
Poor quality: 0 or 1 stars in Selection domain AND 0 stars in Comparability domain AND 0 or 1 stars in outcome/exposure domain									

	Selection				Comparability	Exposure			
Study	**Case definition adequate**	**Representativeness of cases**	**Selection of controls**	**Definition of controls**	**Comparability of cases and controls**	**Ascertain of exposure**	**Same method ascertain exposure**	**Non-response rate**	**Overall quality**
Davenport et al. 2002 England	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	Good
Cruz et al. 2005 Brazil	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	Good
Bassani et al. 2007 Brazil	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	Good
Siqueira et al. 2007 Brazil	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Good
Nabet et al. 2010 France	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	Good
Baskaradoss et al. 2011 India	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Good
Martinez de Tejada et al. 2012 Switzerland	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Good
Jacob et al. 2014 India	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	Good
Noack et al. 2015 Germany	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	Fair
Souza et al. 2015 Brazil	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Good
Wazir et al. 2019 India	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	Good
Lafaurie et al. 2020 Colombia	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	Good
Peña-Sisto et al. 2022 Cuba	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	Good
Hussain et al. 2023 Pakistan	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	Good
Bhavsar et al. 2023	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	Good

Newcastle-Ottawa (NOS) RoB

Good quality: 3 or 4 stars in Selection domain AND 1 or 2 stars in Comparability domain AND 2 or 3 stars in outcome/exposure domain

Fair quality: 2 stars in Selection domain AND 1 or 2 stars in Comparability domain AND 2 or 3 stars in outcome/exposure domain

Poor quality: 0 or 1 stars in Selection domain AND 0 stars in Comparability domain AND 0 or 1 stars in outcome/exposure domain

ROBINS RoB

Study	1. Was the research question or objective in this paper clearly stated?	2. Was the study population clearly specified and defined?	3. Was the participation rate of eligible persons at least 50%?	4. Were all the subjects selected or recruited from the same or similar populations (including the same time period)? Were inclusion and exclusion criteria for being in the study prespecified and applied uniformly to all participants?	5. Was a sample size justification, power description, or variance and effect estimates provided?	6. For the analyses in this paper, were the exposure(s) of interest measured prior to the outcome(s) being measured?	7. Was the timeframe sufficient so that one could reasonably expect to see an association between exposure and outcome if it existed?	8. For exposures that can vary in amount or level, did the study examine different levels of the exposure as related to the outcome (e.g., categories of exposure, or exposure measured as continuous variable)?	9. Were the exposure measures (independent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?	10. Was the exposure(s) assessed more than once over time?	11. Were the outcome measures (dependent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?	12. Were the outcome assessors blinded to the exposure status of participants?	13. Was loss to follow-up after baseline 20% or less?	14. Were key potential confounding variables measured and adjusted statistically for their impact on the relationship between exposure(s) and outcome(s)?	Quality rating
Lunardelli et al. 2005 Brazil	Yes	No	Cannot determine	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Not applicable	Yes	No	Not applicable	Yes	Fair
Jarjoura et al. 2005 USA	Yes	No	Cannot determine	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not applicable	Yes	No	Not applicable	Yes	Fair
Arteaga-Guerra et al. 2010 Colombia	Yes	No	Cannot determine	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Not applicable	Yes	No	Not applicable	No	Poor
Schenkein et al. 2012 USA	Yes	Yes	Cannot determine	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Not applicable	Yes	No	Not applicable	No	Fair
Alves et al. 2016 Brazil	Yes	No	Cannot determine	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Not applicable	Yes	No	Not applicable	No	Poor
Meqa et al. 2017 Republic of Kosovo	Yes	No	Cannot determine	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Not applicable	Yes	No	Not applicable	No	Poor
Micu et al. 2020 Rumania	Yes	Yes	Cannot determine	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not applicable	Yes	Yes	Not applicable	Yes	Fair
Pozo et al. 2020 Spain	Yes	Yes	Cannot determine	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Not applicable	Yes	No	Not applicable	No	Fair
Choi et al. 2021 USA	Yes	Yes	Cannot determine	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Not applicable	Yes	Not applicable	Not applicable	Yes	Fair
Ferrillo et al. 2021 Italy	Yes	Yes	Cannot determine	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not applicable	Yes	Not applicable	Not applicable	No	Fair
Jyotirmay et al. 2021 India	Yes	Yes	Cannot determine	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Not applicable	Yes	No	Not applicable	No	Poor
Lee et al. 2022 Taiwan	No	Yes	Cannot determine	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Not applicable	Yes	Not applicable	Not applicable	No	Fair